

1  
2  
3  
4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8 ALLAN BOYD, *et al.*, }  
9 Plaintiff, } 2:11-CV-00292-RCJ-GWF  
10 v. }  
11 }  
12 DISTRICT ATTORNEYS and PUBLIC }  
13 DEFENDERS, *et al.*, }  
14 Defendants. }

15 Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate  
16 Judge (ECF No. 16) (“Recommendation”) entered on August 11, 2011, in which the Magistrate  
17 Judge recommends that this Court grant Plaintiff’s Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*  
18 (ECF No. 6) and dismiss with prejudice Plaintiff’s Complaint (#1-1).

19 No objection to the Report and Recommendation has been filed.

## I. DISCUSSION

21 This Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or  
22 recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Further, under 28 U.S.C.  
23 § 636(b)(1), if a party makes a timely objection to the magistrate judge’s recommendation,  
24 then this Court is required to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the [report  
25 and recommendation] to which objection is made.”<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, the statute does not  
26 “require[ ] some lesser review by [this Court] when no objections are filed.” Thomas v. Arn, 474

<sup>1</sup> For an objection to be timely, a party must serve and file it within 10 days after being served with the magistrate judge's report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

1 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985). Instead, under the statute, this Court is not required to conduct “any  
2 review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Id.* at 149. Similarly, the  
3 Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge’s  
4 report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. See United States v. Reyna-  
5 Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review employed by the  
6 district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to which no objections were made);  
7 see also Schmidt v. Johnstone, 263 F.Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) (reading the Ninth  
8 Circuit’s decision in Reyna-Tapia as adopting the view that district courts are not required to  
9 review “any issue that is not the subject of an objection.”). Thus, if there is no objection to a  
10 magistrate judge’s recommendation, then this Court may accept the recommendation without  
11 review. See e.g., Johnstone, 263 F.Supp. 2d at 1226 (accepting, without review, a magistrate  
12 judge’s recommendation to which no objection was filed).

13 In this case, there have been no objections filed to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and  
14 Recommendation. Although no objection was filed, this Court has reviewed the Report and  
15 Recommendation (ECF No. 16) and accepts it. Accordingly,

16 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*  
17 (ECF No. 6) is GRANTED.

18 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Complaint is DISMISSED WITH  
19 PREJUDICE.

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 DATED: This 7th day of October, 2011.

22  
23  
24 ROBERT C. JONES  
25 Chief District Court Judge  
26  
27  
28